

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 8, 2009.

Claims 8, 15, and 21 are amended; claims 1-7 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 8-24 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification paragraphs 20, 22, 32, 40-41, 46, 53, and 57.

#### **§ 112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 8-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking adequate description or enablement. Applicant believes that the above amendments now make the perceived ambiguity a moot point. Therefore this rejection is no longer appropriate.

Claims 8-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant believes that the above amendments now render this rejection a moot point.

Specifically, Applicant asserts that throughout the original filed specification, the technique used is to generate an automatic search query from provided search constraints. The search results from that search query are then filtered based on a value assigned to the control field identifier that defines a particular field from the data store, where the filter is a join performed on the search results. The above cited paragraph references particularly paragraph 41 make this point clear. Therefore, there is no ambiguity in the claims now and Applicant believes the claims are in condition for allowance.

#### **§ 103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dettinger et al. (U.S. 7,003,730; hereinafter "Dettinger") in view of Zait (U.S. 7,447,676). To sustain an obviousness rejection, each and every element of the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

The references standing alone or in combination fail to teach generating a search query that is executed to return records where those records are filtered via a join to obtain just those records having a same assigned value as that which is assigned to a control field identifier. The control field identifier separate and apart from the original search query and the join is done on the search results. These elements are now present in one form or another in the above amended independent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the learned Examiner remove the rejections of record and allow the pending claims.

Claims 13 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dettinger in view of Zait, as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of DeLorme et al. (U.S. 5,948,040; hereinafter "DeLorme"). These claims are dependent on amended independent claims; thus, by virtue of their dependencies and in view of the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the corresponding independent claims, claims 13 and 22-24 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same from the learned Examiner.

Claims 14 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dettinger in view of Zait, as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of Chakraborti et al. (U.S. 6,334,131; hereinafter "Chakraborti"). These claims are dependent on amended independent claims; thus, by virtue of their dependencies and in view of the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the corresponding independent claims, claims 14 and 19-20 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same from the learned Examiner.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.


If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-4370.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402--0938  
(513) 942-0224

Date 10-08-2009

By /

  
Joseph P. Mehrle  
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 8<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2009.

Name

Ryan Saunders

Signature

